

REMARKS

Initially, applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 3 and 8.

Claims 13 – 18 have been canceled. Thus, the §112 rejections and the claim objections are now believed to be moot.

In response to the request for information, applicant and the assignee are aware of no prior art that teaches or suggests compensating the home appliance user commensurate to the power consumption of the appliance.

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 7, and 9 - 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over LAPLANTE. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 1 recites a home appliance that receives advertising or sales promotion information and outputs the received information. Although it is known to send ads and coupons to a *user*, e.g., via email or mail, applicant submits that it is not known to send ad/promo information to a home appliance, as claimed. Moreover, displaying ad/promo information at a home appliance is not believed to be taught or suggested by LAPLANTE.

The Examiner acknowledges that LAPLANTE does not teach sending the information to the appliance and then displaying the information at the appliance. The Examiner, however, asserts that such a feature would be obvious, without providing any support for such an assertion. A reference supporting the rejection is respectfully requested. The mere fact that the appliance is a point of sale would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to believe that the LAPLANTE appliance

would receive advertising/promo information and then display such information, particularly because the LAPLANTE appliance does not include or suggest either a display or two-way communications. Rather, the appliance only discloses one-way communications, i.e., sending information from the appliance. The appliance of LAPLANTE does not include any type of display. Finally, LAPLANTE does not provide any reason or suggestion to modify the home appliance in the manner described by the Examiner.

Claim 6 recites a data output system of a home appliance. Claim 10 recites a home appliance including a receiving system that receives advertising information or sales promotion information, and an output system that outputs received information. It is submitted that LAPLANTE does not teach or suggest at least these features of claims 6 and 10.

Consequently, for at least these reasons it is requested that the Examiner provide an indication of the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, and 10.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter of the invention and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. For example, claims 2, 7, and 10 further define the home appliance as a refrigerator. Conventional refrigerators, as well as the LAPLANTE refrigerator, do not include either two-way communication systems or any way to output advertising or sales promotional


information. It is believed that the Examiner has not specifically addressed the limitations of claims 2, 7, and 10. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Hironobu SAKAGUCHI

Res. No. 40,067



---

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

November 8, 2004  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191